REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending, with claims 1 and 10 being independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note the indication on page 4 of the Office Action that claims 3, 4, 12 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although Applicants concur with the Examiner that these claims are not taught by the prior art, independent claims 1 and 10 include other features not taught by the art of record, as set forth more fully below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as allegedly being unpatentable over Amin et al. (USP 5,995,830, "Amin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Amin fails to teach or suggest a method for reconnecting a dropped telephone connection . . . said telephone connection having been established by a telephone call having been initially placed by the calling party to a primary number of the called party through a telephony server, thereby establishing an inbound call from the calling party to the server and an outbound call from the server to the called party, said method comprising, at least:

> (a) monitoring by the server the status of the inbound call, coupled with monitoring by the server the status of the inbound call, and/or
>
> (b) detecting by the server the situation where the status of the inbound call is active and the status of the outbound call is dropped; and /or
>
> (c) attempting by the server to reestablish the telephone connection with the called party should said situation exceed a predetermined period of time; (underlining for emphasis)

as recited in claim 1 and as somewhat similarly recited in system claim 10.

(a) No monitoring of both inbound and outbound calls in Amin by a single telephony server.

Applicants submit that Amin is silent as to any description of a telephony server that monitors the status of the inbound call (from calling party to server), and where the same server monitors status of the outbound call there from (server to called party). In the present application, the server 110 has access to and monitors both the inbound and outbound legs of a call.

Amin's FIG. 1 describes a call interaction between a PSTN 120 and a wireless cellular network 122. Applicants cannot tell, from the description in Amin, what entity the Examiner is relying on for a teaching of the claimed telephony server, in which an inbound call from the calling party is received at the server and an outbound call from the (same) server is sent to the called party. Applicants submit that in the description of a conventional call in Amin, no single entity monitors both the status of an incoming call (or call leg) thereto and an outbound call there from to a called party.

As described in Amin:

> A calling party dials the telephone number associated with mobile telephone 116 at telephone 102. The CO 104 receives the dialed digits and routes the call to IXC 106. IXC 106 routes the call to MSC 110. MSC 110 routes the call to BS 114 with instructions for the BS 114 to establish a wireless communication channel 118 with the mobile telephone 116. In this manner a call is established between the landline telephone 102 and the mobile telephone 116. The MSC 110 stores in its memory 130 the telephone number of both the mobile telephone 116 and, if available, the landline telephone 102 in conjunction with the call. The telephone number of the landline telephone 102 may be received by the MSC 110 as automatic number identification (ANI) information from the IXC 106 in a well known manner. [Amin, col. 3, lns. 30-51].

On the PSTN 120 side, the call from telephone 102 is routed to the wireless network 122. The MSC 110 then routes the call to BS 114 to establish a wireless communication channel 118 with the mobile telephone 116. There is no indication anywhere in Amin that MSC 130 monitors any kind of status of the incoming call from the IXC 106 of the PSTN 120. There is no indication in Amin that any entity in the PSTN 120 (CO 104 or IXC 106) serves to monitor both an inbound call from the calling party and an outbound call to the called party. Thus, there is no single entity in Amin that can be construed as a server that monitors the status of both the inbound call thereto from a calling party and the outbound call there from to a called party.

Applicants kindly submit that claims 1 and 10 and those claims dependent thereon, are allowable for at least the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

(b) No detection by a single server in Amin of a situation where the status of the inbound call is active and the status of the outbound call is dropped.

Notwithstanding the reasons given in (a) above, there is no server in Amin that detects a situation where the status of the inbound call is active and the status of the outbound call is dropped. MSC 130 does not detect a situation of an active status of an incoming call leg thereto, which is the call leg routed from IXC 106, coupled with detecting an outbound call there from (the routing to BS 114, via connection 118 to mobile 116) being dropped. MSC 130 detects only a dropped call when the communication channel 118 between BS 114 and mobile telephone 116 has been dropped; see Amin at col. 4, lns. 17-44, describing step 202 of Fig. 2. There is no indication anywhere in Amin of an entity that is detecting the status of an inbound call when it detects that mobile 116 has dropped the call.

Applicants kindly submit that claims 1 and 10 and those claims dependent thereon, are allowable for at least these additional reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

(c) Amin does not attempt to reestablish the telephone connection with the called party should the situation (where the status of the inbound call is active and the status of the outbound call is dropped) exceed a predetermined period of time.

Amin does attempt to reestablish the connection between telephone 102 and mobile telephone 116, but does not do so based on a situation where status of the inbound call is active and the status of the outbound call is dropped has exceeded a predetermined period of time. Step 210 in the Amin process of FIG. 2 is related to the MSC 130's attempt to reestablish a wireless communications channel with mobile 116. This is described in Amin, col. 5, ln. 60 to col. 6, ln. 19, provided below.

> If it is determined in step 208 that reconnection to the mobile telephone 116 is appropriate, then in step 210 the MSC 110 attempts to re-establish a wireless communication channel with mobile telephone 116. This step may be accompanied by a message from the MSC 110, via IVR processor 112, to the landline telephone 102 indicating that a reconnection attempt is in progress. The reconnection attempt to the mobile telephone 116 may include steps similar to those when a new call to the mobile

> telephone 116 comes in to the MSC 110. As described above in conjunction with the description of routing the original call, the MSC 110 stores in its memory 130, the telephone number of both the mobile telephone 116 and, if available, the landline telephone 102. Thus, the attempt to reconnect may include the MSC 110, via BS 114 (or some other BS connected to MSC 110 if appropriate); paging the mobile telephone 116 to indicate that there is a call for the mobile telephone 116. The paging of a mobile telephone to indicate that there is a call waiting for that telephone is well known and will not be described in detail herein. In an alternate embodiment, instead of automatically attempting to re-establish a wireless communication channel with mobile telephone 116, the user of landline telephone 102 could be presented with the option of whether he/she wants to be reconnected to mobile telephone 116. If the user of landline telephone 102 chooses not to be reconnected to mobile telephone 116, the call could be routed to voice mail node 108 as described above in conjunction with step 218. (underlining for emphasis)

There is no indication that MSC 130 detects a situation where the inbound call from telephone 102 is active and the outbound call at mobile 116 is dropped, and makes an attempt to reconnect after the above situation has exceeded a predetermined period of time. As described in the passage above, the MSC 130 can attempt to re-establish communication and include a message to telephone 102, can page mobile 116, and/or can present options to a user of telephone 102 if he/she desires to be reconnected. There is no indication that any predetermined time is measured after detection the active/dropped status of the inbound/outbound calls before making an attempted reconnection.

Amin indicates in step 212 that a determination of a successful reconnection can be made "by attempting to reconnect for a period of time, and if reconnection is not made within that period of time, the reconnection attempt is deemed unsuccessful. Alternatively, this determination may be made by attempting to reconnect for certain number of attempts, and if reconnection is not made within a number of attempts, the reconnection attempt is deemed unsuccessful." (Amin, col. 6, lns. 20-26). None of these example methods for determining a successful reconnection are based on a situation where status of the inbound call is active and the status of the outbound call is dropped, in which the situation has exceeded a predetermined period of time. In other words, there is no predetermined time period or waiting period in Amin that is set after the MSC 130 detects that the call is dropped, before attempting to reestablish the telephone connection with the called party (mobile 116).

Applicants kindly submit that claims 1 and 10 and those claims dependent thereon, are allowable for at least these additional reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Amin et al. (USP 5,995,830, "Amin") in view of Lin et al. (USP 6,603,849, "Lin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lin is limited to its teachings, allegedly to rerouting an incoming call to an auxiliary number assigned to the called party. However, Lin fails to make up for the deficiencies noted above in Amin, as described in sections (a) through (c) above. Accordingly, claims 19 and 20 are allowable for the reasons set forth above regarding their independent claims 1 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the Examiner's characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, Applicants may have not addressed all characterizations of the art and reserves the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application. The absence of an explicit response by Applicants to any of the Examiner's positions does not constitute a concession of the Examiner's positions. The fact that Applicants' comments have focused on particular arguments does not constitute a concession that there are not other arguments for patentability of the claims. All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to the claims on which they depend.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-20 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 621-7140.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3828 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

45,274

Scott L. Lowe
Registration No. 41458

PO BOX 1364
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364
1.703.621.7140

MJL:edt